

REMARKS

The Office Action of July 19, 2006 has been carefully considered. Reconsideration in view of the foregoing amendments and the present remarks is respectfully requested.

A REPLACEMENT SHEET for the Figure correcting the noted mis-designations is submitted herewith.

Claims 1-11 were rejected as being anticipated by Badger. The rejection states in part:

[B]adger shows...a tuner..characterized in that the tuner comprises at least one identifier (read as address of addressable DAC 32, lines 22-37 of column 2) for identifying at least one database field in a database (read as an inherently existing memory that provides DATA IN to PROM 42, Fig. 1)....

This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In Badger, the microprocessor 40 retrieves digital values stored in the PROM 42, converts these values to equivalent pulse-width modulated (PWM) signals and applies these PWM signals to the respective DAC COMBINERS 32, 34 and 36. (The use of the term "addressable" to describe blocks 32, 34 and 36 would appear to be misleading.) The values applied by the microprocessor in no way "identify at least one database field in a database." If the values did indeed identify at least one database field in a database, then presumably the values could be used to retrieve the information stored in the database field. There is no such possibility in Badger. Moreover, the "inherent" presence of a database as alluded to in the Office Action is a matter of pure speculation.

Withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of claims 1-11 is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Ure, Reg. 33,089

Dated: October 19, 2006